REMARKS

Claims 2-9 and 11-22 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 is canceled.

Claims 12-14 are allowed.

Claims 2, 11, 15, 19, 20 and 22 are rejected.

Claims 3-9, 16-18 and 21 are objected to.

Claims 2, 11, 15, 19-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claim Objections

Claims 2-9 and 20-22 are objected to because of language in the preamble. Claims 3-9, 13-14, 16-18 and 20-22 are amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 2 as amended no longer has the language that the Examiner used as a basis for an objection.

Claim Amendments

Claim 2 has been amended into independent form, incorporating all of the elements of the base independent claim, claim 1. Claims 2 and 15 each include an amendment to clarify the claim language. The added language "an input of" is supported in the specification. See p. 3, line 31 – p. 4, line 3 and Fig. 2.

Claim 19 has been amended to include "generating a busy enable signal with the ready/busy driver controller in response to the power-up signal and the at least one busy signal." This amendment is supported in the specification. See p. 3, line 31 – p. 4, line 3 and Fig. 2.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhou, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,362,669).

Zhou does not teach a "command register coupled to an input of the ready/busy driver controller" as recited in claim 2 as amended. The Examiner cites the configuration circuit 130 of Zhou to show the command register of claim 2. In Zhou, the configuration circuit 130 is coupled to the POR signal from the POR circuit 120. *Zhou, FIG. 1, and col. 1, ll. 24-40.* The improvement in Zhou replaces the POR circuit 120. Thus, at most, Zhou discloses a

configuration circuit 130 coupled to the output of a POR circuit 400, not coupled to an input of a ready/busy driver controller. *Zhou, col. 3, ll. 35-39.*

Therefore, Zhou does not teach a command register as recited in claim 2. Zhou does not teach each and every element of claim 2. Thus, claim 2 is not anticipated by Zhou and the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 2.

Claim 15 as amended has a similar command register as recited in claim 2. As described above, Zhou does not teach such a command register, therefore, Zhou does not teach each and every element of claim 15. The Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 15.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhou, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,362,669).

Zhou does not teach " a level shifter configured to generate the busy enable signal in response to the first and second control signals" as recited in claim 11. Nowhere in Zhou is a level shifter disclosed.

Furthermore, a level shifter is not inherently disclosed by Zhou. "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *MPEP 2112 quoting Ex parte Levy* (emphasis in original). Level shifting does not necessarily flow from the teachings of Zhou.

Therefore, because Zhou does not teach, either explicitly or inherently, a level shifter as recited in claim 11, Zhou does not teach each and every element of claim 11. Zhou does not anticipate claim 11. The Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 11.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhou, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,362,669).

Zhou does not teach "generating a busy enable signal in response to the power-up signal and the at least one busy signal" as recited in claim 19 as amended. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that Zhou teaches a command register as configuration circuit 130, and a ready/busy driver controller (410 cited by the Examiner), the ready/busy driver controller cannot generate a busy enable signal in response to the at least one busy signal because the configuration register 130 is connected to the output of the POR circuit. *Zhou, FIG. 1.*

Therefore, because Zhou does not teach a method including generating a busy enable signal as recited in claim 19, Zhou does not teach each and every element of claim 19. Zhou does not anticipate claim 19. In addition, claims 20 and 22 depend from claim 19. Since claims 20 and 22 include all of the elements of claim 19 and Zhou does not teach each and every element of claim 19, Zhou does not teach each and every element of claim 20 or 22. The Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 19, 20, and 22.

Zhou does not teach "generating a program busy signal" as recited in claim 20. Zhou does not teach a busy signal in relation to programming a device. See Application p. 3, line 33 – p. 4, line 1. Zhou only mentions programming in relation to a PLD. There is no indication of any generation of a busy signal during the programming. *Zhou, col. 1, ll. 15-24.* Therefore, Zhou does not teach each and every element of claim 20. The Applicant requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 20.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-9, 11 and 15-22 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Alan T. McCollom
Reg. No. 28,881

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on October 26, 2005.

Li Mei Vermilya